



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It will be observed that the dying warrior does not send a message of love to his *mistress*, as Moore states, but a message of patriotism and exultant heroism to his *friends*. It is significant, however, that the change which Moore's slip of memory has effected in the original story is just that which Byron's poem also exhibits. Had Moore seen a copy of the poem at the time that he made this entry in his Journal and did the mistake arise from his confusing it with the passage in Busbequius which suggested the image that gives it its peculiar form? This seems hardly likely (although the dates would offer no obstacle to such a supposition, if the stanzas were composed in April, 1819), for he would surely have mentioned the poem in the entry, if he had known of its existence. Moreover, I find no allusion to the piece elsewhere in his Correspondence or in Byron's. It seems most probable, then, that Byron had at some time mentioned to Moore the idea suggested by the passage as a good one to adapt to the purpose for which we find it employed in the *Stanzas to the Po* and that the confusion of memory arose in this way.

At what time did Byron point out this passage to Moore? Moore's words would seem to imply that he did so in person. If this is true, it must have been before April 25, 1816, the day that Byron left England for good (see Moore's *Life of Byron*, p. 305, London, 1901), for the two poets did not meet again until October 8, 1819 (see *ibid.*, p. 410). The thought suggests itself naturally that Byron may have composed, even at this early date—before he left England—some poem based on the passage in Busbequius, but this is not likely. At any rate, there is no evidence that he did. Nor is there anything to show that he "pointed out" this passage by letter to Moore. It would appear, then, that he kept the suggestion, as a highly poetical one, long in mind and finally used it in the manner that we have seen.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

University of Tennessee.

GRAY'S ELEGY.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—There is an interesting parallelism

between Gray's *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* and a section of Virgil's second Georgic. Beginning with "O fortunatos nimium," line 458, Virgil gives a picture of the life of a husbandman which reminds one of the setting of the *Elegy*.

It is to be remembered that the point of view of the two poets was entirely different. Although he recognizes the fact that much hard labor falls to the lot of the husbandman, Virgil considers his life more delightful than any other except that of the philosopher. Gray sees the hardness of the husbandman's lot and seeks to find some compensation for it. Notwithstanding this difference in point of view, there is a marked similarity in the impressions given by the two poems. The details in the two pictures are very much alike, as is also the method of treatment. In both poems the life of the husbandman is described not only in terms of what he enjoys, but also in terms of what he escapes, by reason of his situation.

Below are some examples illustrating the parallelism in the two pictures. The first example is perhaps the least striking of the number:

1. The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea,
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.

... At latiss otia fundis,
Speluncae, vivique lacus, et frigida Tempe,
Mugitusque boum mollesque sub arbore somni
Non absunt. l. 468 f.

2. For them no more the blazing hearth shall burn,
Or busy housewife ply her evening care:
No children run to lisp their sire's return,
Or climb his knees the envied kiss to share.

Interea dulces pendent circum oscula nati,
Casta pudicitiam servat domus. l. 523 f.

3. Oft did the harvest to their sickle yield,
Their furrow oft the stubborn glebe has broke:
How jocund did they drive their team afield;
How bowed the woods beneath their sturdy stroke!

Agricola incurvo terram dimovit aratro:
Hinc anni labor, hinc patriam pavosque penates
Sustinet, hinc armenta boum meritosque iuvenco.
l. 513 f.

4. Th' applause of list'ning senates to command,
The threats of pain and ruin to despise,
To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land
And read their hist'ry in a nation's eyes,

Their lot forbade : nor circumscribed alone
 Their growing virtues, but their crimes confin'd ;
 Forbade to wade through slaughter to a throne,
 And shut the gates of mercy on mankind.

Hic stupet attonitus rostris ; hunc plausus hiantem
 Per cuneos geminatus enim plebisque patrumque
 Corripuit ; gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum.

l. 508 f.

5. Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife,
 Their sober wishes never learned to stray ;
 Along the cool sequester'd vale of life
 They kept the noiseless tenor of their way.

Illum non populi fasces, non purpura regum
 Flexit et infidos agitans discordia fratres. l. 495 f.

H. P. JOHNSON.

University of Mississippi.

OS. GENESIS, 285 ff.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—OS. *Genesis*, 285 ff. :

*Suati furdhur skred
 narouua naht an skion, nahida moragan
 an allara seliða gihuuem, uhtfugal sang
 fora daga huom.*

After looking over the various conjectures on l. 288 recorded in Piper's edition, it occurred to me that the text could be improved more satisfactorily by reading *fora dagawōman*,—an emendation suggested by the well-known Old English expressions *dægwoma*, and *dægredwoma* (Grimm's edition of *Andreas & Elene*, pp. xxx f., Krapp's note on *Andreas*, 125). Cf. OE. *Exodus*, 344 : *dæg-woma becwom / ofer garsecge(?)*, *Godes beacna sum, / morgen mæretorht*; *Guðl.*, 1265 : *oðæt eastan cwom / ofer deop gelad dægredwoma, / wedertacen wearm*; *Andr.*, 123 : *nihthelm toglað, / lungre leorde*; *leoht æfter com, / dægredwoma*. On turning to Behaghel's edition (1903), I noticed that the correction *dagawōman*, or rather the still better *dagas wōman* had been submitted before by Kluge and Symons; in particular, the latter scholar was found to have plausibly explained the genesis of the scribal blunder (through misreading of *dagasuwomā*, the long form of the *s* being used). Since, however, this view has so far met with scant favor—having been scorned by all the editors (Braune, Piper, Holthausen, Behaghel,

Heyne)—, it may not be amiss to put in a word by way of additional support.

Of the seven divisions of night as enumerated in Ælfric's version of Bede's *De Temporibus* and in Byrhtferð's *Handboc* (see Tupper's instructive paper in *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, x, 111 ff., especially 126 f.), viz., *æfengloma*, *æfen*, 'conticinium' or *switima*, *midniht*, *hancned*, *dægred*, *ærnemergen* (followed by *sunnan upgang*), the 'cockcrowing,' it is interesting to observe, precedes immediately the *dægred*, which latter division we are clearly warranted in identifying with the OE. *dægredwoma* = *dægwoma*. That *uhtfugal* denotes the cock (cf. OE. *on uhtu-tid* = *galli cantu*, B.-T., s. v. *uhtan-tid*), is probably admitted by everybody, unless Kauffmann should stick to his preference for the nightingale (*Z. f. d. Ph.*, xxxii, 509). As to the position of *uhta*, "the hour before dawn" (Tupper, *l. c.*, 147), we may compare also *Sat.*, 465 : *þis wæs on uhtan eall geworden / ær dægrede*, and *Cur. Past.*, p. 458 : *ðæs cocces ðeaw is ðæt he micle hludor singð on uhtan ðonne on dægred*; *ac ðonne hit nealæoð dæge, ðonne singð he smalor and smicror* (Tupper, *l. c.*, 150). This use of *fora* in a temporal sense, it is true (Franck, *Z. f. d. A.*, xl, 213), cannot be paralleled in Old Saxon, but the same remark would apply to *furi* (in prepositional function),—at least according to Heyne.

Moreover, it appears that of the nine conjectures proposed, the one here advocated and Gallée's *dagaliomon*¹ (or Schlüter's *dagas lioman*) are the most satisfactory ones from the stylistic point of view, and of these two, *dagas woman* has a decidedly better chance by reason of the illustrations referred to.

Whether the irregular position of the alliteration in *uhtfugal sang* is to be tolerated or, with Holthausen, to be exchanged for *sang uhtfugal*, it is difficult to decide; in the latter case, *Jud.*, 211 : *sang hildeleoð* could be cited as a parallel.

In quoting the passage under discussion, the comma has deliberately been placed before *uhtfugal*.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

¹Gallée's paper in *Tijdschrift voor nederl. Taal- en Letterk.* is not accessible to me.